



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

VOLUME XXXIV

JANUARY 1918

NUMBER 2

## NOTES ON EGYPTO-SEMITIC ETYMOLOGY

BY W. F. ALBRIGHT  
Johns Hopkins University

The problem of the relationship between Egyptian and the other Semitic languages is at last approaching a solution, after having eluded the analysis of two generations of philologists. The intuition of the masters, Benfey and Bötticher (De Lagarde), though supported by insufficient material and imperfect method, has justified itself—Egyptian is indeed a Semitic tongue. In the following pages I hope to contribute in some slight degree to the confirmation of this thesis.

While the phonetic laws governing the development of Egyptian were still unknown, who can wonder at the slowness of the gains made even by such men as Brugsch, Erman, and Hommel? Of course, if they had devoted themselves more intensively to the task, progress would doubtless have been more rapid. Moreover, the workers were seldom equipped with the wide linguistic knowledge combined with scientific caution which is necessary for such investigations.

After Erman's epoch-making article, "Das Verhältniß des Aegyptischen zu den semitischen Sprachen" (*ZDMG*,<sup>1</sup> XLVI, 93-129),

<sup>1</sup> Note the following abbreviations: *ÄGl*=Erman, *Ägyptisches Glossar*; *AJSL*=*American Journal of Semitic Languages*; *ÄZ*=*Ägyptische Zeitschrift*; *BA*=*Beiträge zur Assyriologie*; *GB*=Gesenius-Buhl, *Hebräisches Wörterbuch*; *HW*=Delitzsch, *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch*; *JAOS*=*Journal of the American Oriental Society*; *JBL*=*Journal of Biblical Literature*; *JEA*=*Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*; *JRAS*=*Journal of the*

Semitists might have occupied themselves seriously with the matter, had it not been for the strong opposition which immediately made itself felt in the camp of Egyptology. The two foremost Egyptologists of England and France, Renouf and Maspero, cast their powerful vote against the admission of Egyptian into the family of Semitic languages, and effectually blackballed it, for a time. Since then the question has resolved itself into a factional controversy between the adherents of the Berlin school and the followers of Maspero, Naville, and Petrie. Erman and Sethe have erected a grammatical and morphological system strikingly Semitic in appearance, a fact which led so careful a philologist as Zimmern to accept the views of Erman. Besides this, they have rescued the weak consonants, 𐤀, 𐤁, 𐤂, and 𐤃, from their degradation to the vocalic rank, a mistake of the early Egyptologists which naturally arose from the study of the degenerate syllabic script which prevailed during the last millennium of hieroglyphic history. In some respects their error was as grave as De Saulcy's unfortunate effort to analyze cuneiform from the consonantal point of view, in this case due to over-respect for the analogy of West Semitic script. The Semitic Babylonians borrowed their script from non-Semitic predecessors, whose written characters were syllabic because they originated as ideograms representing the words of a largely monosyllabic speech. The Egyptians, on the other hand, invented their own writing, to reproduce a dissyllabic, triconsonantal vocabulary, with outstanding consonantism.<sup>1</sup> Once made, the error perpetuated itself most tenaciously. What a pity that the last

*Royal Asiatic Society; JSOR=Journal of the Society of Oriental Research; KD=Růžička, Konsonantische Dissimilation in den semitischen Sprachen (=BA, VI, 4); LA=Lisân el-'arab; MVAG=Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft; OLZ=Orientalistische Literaturzeitung; PSBA=Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology; RA=Revue d'Assyriologie; RT=Recueil de Travaux; SGL=Delitzsch, Sumerisches Glossar; TA=Tag el-'Arûs; VG=Brockelmann, Vergleichende Grammatik; WB=Brugsch, Wörterbuch; WZKM=Wiener Zeitschrift für Kunde des Morgenlandes; ZA=Zeitschrift für Assyriologie; ZDMG=Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.*

<sup>1</sup> Now, thanks to Gardiner's brilliant work (see *JEA*, III [1916], 1-16), the probability that the "Phoenician" script is Egyptian in origin, or at least draws its inspiration from hieroglyphic sources, is immeasurably increased. This is just what should have been expected from the functional identity of the hieroglyphic alphabet and the West Semitic. We can now confidently wave aside the cuneiform theories of Hommel, Ball, and Peiser (cf. Delitzsch, *Entstehung*, pp. 221 ff.). On the other hand, we now see that the lapidary hieroglyphic style, and not the cursive hieratic, provided the starting-point, so the once-popular De Rouge-Taylor view cannot be readmitted to favor, though its basic idea turns out to be correct.

work<sup>1</sup> of the gifted Maspero should be devoted to the support of an antiquated system!

The history of the controversy over the Semitic character of Egyptian is as curious and interesting as the debate over the existence of Sumerian, and, when the concluding episodes have been enacted, will be worthy the pen of another Weissbach. Joseph Halévy lost his well-contested struggle, and died fighting for a hopeless cause, but the name of Aaron Ember will pass into history under different auspices.

The researches of Professor Ember are placing the new study on a secure foundation. Errors must inevitably be made; the workers are fully conscious of this and endeavor to reduce the number by publishing only etymologies which have been subjected to a severe criticism and have fulfilled certain methodical requirements, phonetic and semantic. Acting on this principle, Professor Ember has published only the moiety of his combinations so far.<sup>2</sup> I have imitated his example, omitting many precarious etymologies from the list which I subjoin. Perhaps the process of elimination should have been carried still further, but the subjective character of such an operation made me hesitate; many of Ember's old comparisons, afterward rejected, have turned out since to be probably correct. Some may object to my semasiological methods—in some cases, no doubt, with justice. However, any philologist knows that the most astonishing changes in the meaning of words do occur, as testified by innumerable instances of antiphrasis. In Semitic, semantic changes play an unusually important rôle; the number of *addâd* is very great.

As the Semitic occupation of Egypt fell in prehistoric times, surely not later than 4000 B.C., and perhaps millenniums earlier, we could not expect to find the idiom unmodified. Superimposed as it was upon a non-Semitic base, which we may postulate with a high degree of probability (see below), the morphology and vocabulary could not

<sup>1</sup> "Introduction à l'étude de la phonétique égyptienne" (*RT*, XXXVII-XXXVIII). Contrast Naville, *JE A*, III, 233.

<sup>2</sup> See *ÄZ*, XLIX, 87 ff.; *L*, 86 ff.; *LI*, 110 ff.; *OLZ*, XVII, 6; *XIX*, 72 ff.; *ZA*, XXVIII, 302 ff.; also Spiegelberg, *OLZ*, XVII, 424. At the beginning of the war, Professor Ember sent several additional papers to Germany, but if published they have been, of course, unable to reach this country.

but be affected. Foreign vocal organs change unaccustomed sounds to suit wonted movements,<sup>1</sup> and grammar is correspondingly influenced on the psychological side. An advanced stage of culture continues the disintegrating process; in the complex and busy life of civilization men have not the time to enunciate clearly—there is a constant chopping, slurring, and sloughing of difficult sounds. Consequently, we find Lithuanian and Arab speaking the most archaic form of their respective stocks; French and Egyptian stand at the opposite extremity. We may expect to find these processes of reduction carried to their fullest extent. Such phenomena as the loss of consonants—in Babylonia the weak laryngeals, in Egypt the liquids—their assimilation and dissimilation must be looked for. Judging from Coptic, we may also expect palatalization to play its part. Consonantal metathesis, one of the most characteristic features of Semitic phonology, and very common in Coptic (as well as in modern Egyptian-Arabic), will be found. Egyptologists, to be sure, take it for granted, but Semitic lexicographers, led by Barth, are just beginning to grasp its full significance. The great Swedish Arabist and dialectologist, Count Landberg, says (*Datīnah*, p. 792): “La métathèse est d’un intérêt capital pour bien juger de la nature des racines sémitiques.” In recent years Professor Haupt is becoming increasingly impressed with the fundamental importance of metathesis, especially in Assyrian, and almost every one of his articles bears fresh testimony to the fertility of this new field of etymological research. Such transposed series as *brk-krb-rkb*; *kmr-krm-mkr-rmk*, ‘to pour’ (Haupt, *AJSL*, XXXII, 64 ff.); *khl-ḥkl-ḥlk-klh*, ‘be dark’ (Haupt, *OLZ*, XVI, 492); *qrb-qlb-qbl* (Haupt, *AJSL*, XXVI, 3); *rz̄m-r̄mz-zmr*, ‘wink’ (Haupt), are a few illustrations from a multitude. Naturally, caution is very necessary in this somewhat tricky new path. Ember pointed out a number of Egyptian cases in his very first work (cf. *ÄZ*, XLIX, 92; L, 89): e.g., *wd*, ‘command,’ = צוה (Erman); *rkḥ*, ‘burn,’ = חרף (حرق part. assim. to ح); *mri*, ‘love,’ = رَم ( = Assyr. *rāmu*, Barth); *dmd*, ‘unite,’ = ضمد (also

<sup>1</sup> In Spanish, e.g., influences of this kind are unusually clear (cf. Gerland, pp. 4, 27, in Gröber's *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*<sup>2</sup>), where Latin has been affected by Ibero-Basque. In the latter there is no *f*; hence Latin initial *f* became reduced to a faint aspirate (indicated graphically by *h*). Initial *ll* and *n mouillé*, very common in Basque, are almost equally so in Spanish.

Hommel); *bhn*, 'bark,' = *نبح* (von Calice); *hpd*, 'thigh,' = *نخذ*; *rt*, 'jawbone,' = *رث* (Sethe), etc.

However, we have no right to assume that the Egyptian language is purely Semitic. A priori we should not expect this, since the civilization of the Nile contains so many non-Semitic, African features. A great many Egyptian ideas and customs are purely African, as has been abundantly proved by Petrie, Amélineau, and especially Seligman, whose recent work is exceedingly valuable. The animistic *k3*-system, for example, is entirely African;<sup>1</sup> neither among Semites nor Indo-Europeans do we find anything like it. The demons and genii of the Sumerians are quite different.<sup>1</sup> Again, totemism and zoölatry are ubiquitous in Egypt and also in Central Africa (cf. Amélineau's *Prolegomènes à l'étude de la religion égyptienne*, I, 85 ff.); Semitic, Mesopotamian, and Hellenic totemism are still the airiest reconstructions. In these countries zoölatry is economic and symbolic, not totemistic. To make a rather free generalization, the Egyptian religion is the syncretism of African totemism and animism with Semitic "nature worship."<sup>2</sup>

This pre-Semitic race was not Negroid, as formerly supposed. Elliot Smith (a safer guide in anatomy than in anthropology) and

<sup>1</sup> See especially Seligman, *Ancient Egypt*, 1915, pp. 103 ff. Langdon's remarks on the Sumerian "god of a man" only show more clearly than ever the difference between these African and Sumerian postanimistic (*sit venia verbo*) conceptions; see *JEA*, II, 239-40.

<sup>2</sup> It is yet too early to undertake seriously the measurement of Semitic influences in Egyptian religion and mythology. Probably the profoundest effect lay in the introduction of a Semitic nomenclature, though the Semitic mind must have modified the earlier system greatly in other ways. The animal-gods have generally received Semitic names,

as *Hnm* (حمل, 'ram,' Ember), Horus (طير الحمر), Sokaris (صقر), *Rrt*, the hippopotamus-goddess (Ember: *ḥp* = 'hog'; cf. *خنزير الماء* = 'hippopotamus.' The Semitic equivalent is *ררר*, 'slime'; cf. Gr. *σίαλον*, 'slime,' and *σίαλος*, 'hog'). In this paper I shall add the following names to the list: *Šbk*, the crocodile-god; *Hqt*, the frog-goddess; and *Srgt*, the scorpion-goddess. We have Semitic etymologies for most of the divine names, but, as a discussion which would necessitate elaborate comparative excursions is entirely out of place here, I will not enter into details. Suffice it to say that such divine names as Osiris, *Rē*, Amōn, Ptah, Min, etc., are almost certainly Semitic. Some of them, like *Rē* and Amōn, are secondary appellations, the original names being, like *יְהוָה* in Judaism, too sacred to pronounce. *Rē*, for instance, means 'shepherd,' just as Šamaš is called *rē-ū šaplāti nāqīdu elāti* (*KB*, VI, 2, 96, l. 33), 'the herd of the lower regions, the shepherd of the upper regions.' In Heliopolis he sat enthroned with the *hq3*-staff, or shepherd's crook, the scepter of majesty. Other such secondary cult-names are *Šhmt*, *Mšhnt* (see below), etc., which may, for all we know, have taken the place sometimes of non-Semitic names. Even the river-god *H'pi* (Apis) is Semitic in name (see below).

F. W. Müller (in Vol. 27, the publications of the Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft) have shown conclusively that the anatomy of the pre-dynastic Egyptians was singularly free from Negroid characteristics, which do not make themselves apparent until well along in dynastic times, when Negro slaves became common. In remote prehistoric times there must have been contact and interchange of customs in one way or another; the Sahara was not then the barrier it later became, owing to the progress of dessication in this quarter. Possibly—but I will abstain from idle speculation. At all events, the Bantu did not occupy so large a portion of Africa as today.

I wish to suggest the possibility that the Semites were preceded in Egypt by a race of the Mediterranean group, a theory supported, not only by anatomical (so Müller, *op. cit.*), but also by philological and ethnographic considerations. This interesting family of semi-incorporating languages is gradually taking shape before our eyes, though their mutual relationship often seems as problematic as in the case of our North American Indian stocks. Thanks to the work of Bork, Herbig, Kluge, Kretschmer, Schuchhardt, Heinrich Winkler, and many others, the Mediterranean group, including the modern dialects of the Caucasus (Caucasian), Georgian, Circassian, Abkhasian, Karthvelian, etc., and Chaldian (Vannic), Mitannian, Elamite, Lycian, Lydian, Etruscan, Basque, etc., takes its place beside Semitic and Indo-European. Hittite probably does not belong to this stock.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand Sumerian probably does. Recently a very serious attempt to combine Sumerian with the Caucasian group has been made by a Georgian scholar, Tseretheli, in a monograph entitled "Sumerian and Georgian" (*JRAS*, 1913, pp. 783–821; 1914, pp. 1–36; 1915, pp. 255–88; 1916, pp. 1–58). The work makes a very favorable impression, thanks to the author's scientific method and his lack of dogmatism. Tseretheli's command of Georgian cannot be doubted, while his philological control of the Caucasian languages is attested by the name of Marr. Moreover, he seems to have studied the literature of Sumeriology carefully,

<sup>1</sup> See Hrozný, *MDOG*, No. 56, December, 1915, and in the *Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie*, March 13, 1916, where he replies very successfully to Bartholomae (*op. cit.*, January 17; see also the latter's rejoinder to Hrozný, March 13). Hrozný is supported by the weighty authority of Kretschmer and Eduard Meyer. The first fascicle of his *Sprache der Hethiter* is said to have appeared in 1916 (Leipzig: Hinrichs); see Cumont, *Comptes Rendus, Acad. des Inscr.*, 1917, pp. 119–24.

besides having assistance from Zimmern, Bezold, and Langdon. While some of the Sumerian words are doubtful, the combined effect of over 250 comparisons is impressive. More significant, however, is the extended grammatical comparison which precedes, exhibiting a series of striking parallels between Sumerian and Georgian in pronouns, noun inflection, postpositions, and verbal structure, where we have in both (just as in Basque) the incorporation of pronominal elements in the verb-complex. Professor Haupt is strongly disposed to agree with the Caucasian theory of Sumerian affiliation. His support is the more weighty because of his vigorous opposition to all previous hypotheses; in the *Sumerische Familiengesetze*, published in 1879, he said (p. vi): "eine uralaltäische Sprache ist nämlich nach meiner Überzeugung das Sumerische ganz entschieden nicht," a conclusion which was warmly indorsed by the Ural-altaist Donner (see his exposition in Haupt, *Die akkadische Sprache*, Berlin, 1883, pp. 39-48).

A number of curious facts may be mentioned which point to the existence of the Mediterranean race in Northern Africa before the arrival of the so-called Hamitic stock. Here we can, with no small degree of confidence, rely on Schuchhardt (*WZKM*, XXVII, 163 ff.), whose ability and care are beyond cavil, while his methodical training was acquired in the school of Romance philology, that pattern and model of linguistic science. With his usual caution he directs attention to the fact that the Meroitic of the inscriptions partly deciphered by Griffith bears no connection with Christian Nubian and its daughter, the Nuba of our day, just as Lidzbarski (cf. Schuchhardt, p. 183) finds that there is no visible kinship between the Numidian of the inscriptions and modern Berber. Schuchhardt (pp. 172 f.) compares some Meroitic formations in *l* with corresponding Georgian, prudently, however, "ohne auf einen geschichtlichen Zusammenhang hinzielen zu wollen."

There is a remarkable similarity between some Egyptian and Mitannian terms of relationship, first alluded to, so far as I know, by Jensen, *ZA*, VI, 64 f., who remarks: "Dass gleichwohl das Mitannische nichts mit dem Aegyptischen zu tun hat, sieht jeder." Coincidences of this kind may easily be fortuitous,<sup>1</sup> but the words should

<sup>1</sup> As a few rather superfluous examples of coincidence, cf. Eg. *lwn*, Perso-Arabic *اوان*, Susian *hiġan* (Hüsing, *BA*, V, 410), all centering around the meaning 'colonnade'; Eg. *mtr*, 'witness,' Gr. *μάρτυρος*, Mitra, god of the oath; Sum. *imbar*, 'rainstorm,' Lat. *imber*; the



at least be compared with care, as chance plays strange pranks now and then. Eg. *itf*, 'father' (for formation, cf. Steindorff, *Koptische Grammatik*, § 123), originally *itī*, pronounced perhaps *\*at(t)ai > iât >* Coptic ΕΙΩΤ, reminds one of Mit. *attai*, Elam. *atta*, Sum. *ad(d)a*, Anatolian *atti-s* (Attis, consort of Mâ). Just as *itī* comes to mean 'king,' so *adda* means 'prince,' or the like, in Sumerian (Kudur-mabuk is the *adda Emutbal* = *abu Emutbala*; *RA*, II, 93, col. 1, l. 2). 'Brother' is *śn* in Egyptian, while in Mitannian it is *sena*.<sup>1</sup> Eg. *s³*, or 'son,' resembles Mit. *\*sa* (Mit. *ša-la*, 'daughter,' with which compare Elam. *ša-k*, 'son,' and *e-la*, 'sister,' while *i-ke* = 'brother'; Bork, *Mitannisprache*, p. 79). Here the similarity is probably misleading, because *s³* (pronounced *siā*; Ranke, *op. cit.*, p. 58) goes back to *z³* (*ziā*).<sup>2</sup> The feminines *mwt*, 'mother,' and *š3t*, 'daughter,' are, of course, secondary and do not assist us. It must be noted, however, that *śn* and *s³* may be Semitic; Ember compares *śnwi*, 'two' ('second' is used in the sense of 'companion' both in Egyptian and in Hebrew; cf. Eccles. 4:8, 10), and זרע, 'seed,' Assy. *zêru*, 'offspring' (cf. Eth. **HCĀ**; *zár'ě*, where the **Ṣ** is also lost). At all events, we must reckon with the possibility that there are Mediterranean elements in Egyptian,<sup>3</sup> and the probability that there are such in Berber, where the Semitic character of the language is so adulterated as to be barely visible. In the true Hamitic languages the Semitic structure is becoming steadily clearer, so that comparative researchers should busy themselves with them before tackling the more inscrutable Berber.

proportion *wick* : *wicked* = *mèche* : *méchant*! On this matter cf. Weissbach, *Die Sumerische Frage*, p. 160. A very curious case is presented by the words for 'span' in Arabic, Ethiopic, and Egyptian, *šibr*, *sêzr*, and *šsp*. Had Praetorius considered the Egyptian he would hardly have combined the other two (*BA*, I, 44 f.).

<sup>1</sup> Written *šena*; in the Akkadian (Semitic "Babylonian") of northern Mesopotamia the values of the sibilants were interchanged; the Egyptologist may examine the cases given by Ranke, *Keilinschriftliches Material zur altägyptischen Vokalisation*, p. 91: Eg. *š* = cuneiform *š*; cf. *R'mšš* = רעמסש = *Riamašša*. The Egyptians did not attain such precision as their Euphratean neighbors in the transcription of foreign names; what were barbarian names to the chosen people (*rôme*)? Consequently, such Egyptian transcriptions are well-nigh valueless for etymological purposes; contrast Burchardt, *m³ ħrw*, *Altkananäische Fremdworte*, § 158.

<sup>2</sup> Ember has shown that *s* ("liegendes s") is the etymological equivalent of *z* in the Semitic languages. In the Pyramid Texts there is virtually no confusion of *s* and *š*, and words containing *s* always, except where assimilation has entered, equate themselves with Semitic words containing *z*. I will give more illustrations of this law in the following.

<sup>3</sup> I have run across a curious coincidence in Etruscan *zix*, 'write,' which exhibits the same consonantal structure as Eg. *šh*, 'write.' Doubtless it is merely a coincidence, though our efforts to find a Semitic equivalent for *šh* have thus far proved vain.

The Hamitic languages, being thus more or less influenced by strange associations, and having been separated for many millenniums from their Semitic hearth, may well be expected to conceal an Asiatic origin. Since, even in Old Egyptian, Semitic words are often curiously altered, the perils attending the search for Semitic roots in modern Hamitic are great enough to terrify the most adventurous. Yet we must not hesitate; a beginning has already been made by Reinisch and others, especially in the comparative study of the different Hamitic languages.<sup>1</sup> Professor Ember is meeting with excellent results in the comparison of Egyptian and "Hamitic" words. He has now scores of unquestionably correct equations, as well as a great many probably correct. In some cases the root is clearly Semitic; sometimes we are in doubt. In other cases these words may be non-Semitic, wherever their ultimate origin is to be sought.

The possibilities for corruption and decay of Semitic words in Egyptian have been touched on above; Erman has illustrated the situation by comparing modern Italian and French (*ZDMG*, XLVI, 128, n. 1): "Wäre beispielsweise das Französische in der gleichen Weise überliefert wie das Ägyptische, so würden wenige die Mut haben \*š<sup>2</sup> oder \*š (*chat*) zu *gatto* . . . . \*š<sup>2</sup>p<sup>2</sup> (*épée*) zu *spada* . . . . zu stellen." From one point of view the comparison is overdrawn; the consonantal structure of classical Arabic is but little removed from that of parent Semitic. To take French and Latin, who would venture to derive \*š<sup>2</sup>w (*Août*) from *Augustus*, \*š<sup>c2</sup> (*chien*) from *canis*, *in* (*île*) from *insula*?

In order to prove the consanguinity of two languages, or linguistic groups, it is necessary to establish their agreement in certain elementary categories, such as the names of the parts of the body and the cardinal numbers. As Sethe and Ember have shown, the former are in Egyptian mostly Semitic, though the old names have been replaced in a number of cases by neoplasms. The words for 'hand,' *d* (𐎡); 'eye,' <sup>c</sup>n (𐎡); 'ear,' *idn* (اذن); 'tooth,' *śn* (in the lance-head;

<sup>1</sup> It is greatly to be hoped that Professor Max Müller will soon be able to publish his comparative researches on the Hamitic languages. In such able hands the puzzling material should shape itself into harmonious lines. It is a pity that Egyptologists have not generally adopted Müller's theory of the "syllabic" writing, which is quite evident to a cuneiformist. Perhaps the lucid presentation of the subject in *MVAG* will draw more converts.

<sup>2</sup> For Eg. <sup>c</sup> = <sup>n</sup> see below.

cf. *سنان*), are preserved as sign-values or in derived meanings. Many other words are retained, as *nš*, 'tongue' (*לִשְׁוֹן*, *לִשָּׁה*); *špt*, 'lip' (*שִׁפְהָ*; for *š*=*ש* see my comments on *špr*, below); *db̄*, 'finger' (*אֶצְבָּע*, *šābu*); *ib*, 'heart' (*לֵב*, *לִבְבִי*); *rš*, 'head' (in *rš*, 'south,' toward the source [*רֵאשׁוּ*, *rēšu*] of the Nile; *wrš*, 'headrest'); *d̄d̄*, 'head' (*גִּלְגֻּלָּה*, Ember); *q̄b*, 'entrails' (*קֶרֶב*); *drt*, 'arm'=*זֶרֶחַ* (Müller in *GB*; also Ember independently); *rd*, 'foot, leg' (*مِرْدَاة*, Ember; *rittu*, 'paw, hand,' for *\*ridtu* like *qātu*, 'hand,' for *\*qantu* [so Haupt], from *קָנָה*, *qanū*, 'grasp,' Albright); *w<sup>r</sup>rt*, 'leg' (from *w<sup>r</sup>*=*وَعَلَ*, by-form of *עָלָה*, *Elu*, Ember); *ḡt*, 'hoof' (*רִגְלִי*, *ḡt*; *ḡt*, Ember); *p̄d*, 'leg' (*purīdu*, Ember); *hpd*, 'thigh,'=*فخذ* (for *d*=*ذ* cf. *idn*=*اذن*), Ember); *b̄h*, 'phallus' (*بُوح*, Ember); *š̄*, 'back' (*سَراة*, Ember); *mnd*, 'breast' (from *mnd*, 'suckle,'=*مَلَج*, *\*malāgu*, Ember); *q̄bt*, 'nipple' (*كُعب*, Ember). Many others, mostly secondary in Egyptian, have good Semitic etymologies, while still others are doubtful. In the following pages I shall propose still other etymologies, among them *hnt*, 'nose,'=*خَظَم*, *hntimmu*; *hp̄*, 'navel,'=*חֶבֶר*, *hēnbért*, from *חָבַר*, *\*ebēru*, 'bind'; *hb̄*, 'throat,' conn. with *hururtu*. In short, we have Semitic etymologies for more than forty Egyptian names of parts of the body.<sup>1</sup>

No less decisive are the numerals. The latest defense of their Semitic origin is found in a work by Sethe, entitled, *Von Zahlen und Zahlworten bei den alten Ägyptern* (Strassburg, 1916), which is, of course, inaccessible to us, but has been reviewed circumstantially by the able English Egyptologist, Battiscombe Gunn, *JEA*, III, 279 ff. Sethe maintains that the cardinals up to ten are Semitic, with the exception of *hmt*, 'three,' which I regard as also Semitic (see below). Of the higher numbers the majority seem to be Semitic. Stating the relationship in tabular form, for the sake of simplicity, we have:

1.  $w^c2 < w^c d^3 < whd = \text{وحد}$  (Ember).

<sup>1</sup> Since the above was written Professor Ember has discovered several more excellent etymologies belonging to this class.

<sup>2</sup> For dropping of the *d* cf. *šš*, 'six,' for *سدس*; *w<sup>r</sup>r*, 'cord,' for *وتر* (Spiegelberg). It is, of course, very common in French. Cf. also loss of final *n* in *ib̄*, 'chessman,' for *אֶבֶן* (Ember).

<sup>3</sup> Since *c* is the sonant corresponding to the voiceless *h*, the assimilation of the latter to *c* between the sonants *w* and *d* is a faultless phonetic process.

2.  $\acute{s}n(wi) < \theta ni = \text{ثنى}$ .
3.  $hmt^1 < hnt^2 < \acute{s}nt < \acute{s}lt^3 < \theta l\theta = \text{ثلث}$ .
4.  $(?)ifd = \text{ربع}$ <sup>4</sup> (Sethe).
5.  $dw = \text{يد}$ <sup>5</sup> (Sethe).
6.  $\acute{s}i\acute{s} < \acute{s}d\acute{s} = \text{سدس}$ <sup>6</sup>.
7.  $\acute{s}fh^7 < \acute{s}fh^8 < \acute{s}f^c{}^9 < \acute{s}b^c = \text{سبع}$ .

<sup>1</sup> *Hmt* for *\*hnt* is on a par with Assyr. *Gintu* for *Gintu* (𐎶𐎵 for *\*gint* from a stem *𐎶𐎵𐎶𐎵*, *inamdin* for *inandin*; Ar. *صدر*, *صدر*, *صدر*, *صدر*, etc. *KD*, pp. 147 ff.; cf. also Brugmann, *Grundriss*<sup>2</sup>, § 400, 1, etc.). In Ethiopic there is a host of illustrations for the dissimilation of *m* to *n* before a labial; see below, *s.v. gbt* and *KD*, pp. 116 ff. Since *m* was often assimilated to a following dental, as in *hnt*, 'nose' (*q.v.*), for *\*hmt* = *hufm*, and *hnt*, 'skin-bottle,' for *\*hmt* = 𐩧𐩢𐩨 (Ember), confusion ensued, and the reverse process set in, a phenomenon which is exceedingly common in language.

<sup>2</sup> For *h* < *s* cf. *hmn*, 'eight,' and below.

<sup>3</sup> The form *slt* is actually found in South Arabian. The inscriptions give the form *slθ* (due, of course, to dissimilation), which appears in Ethiopic as *šalds*. In Mehri *slθ* becomes, by a further dissimilation, *slt* (cf. *KD*, p. 174).

<sup>4</sup> According to Gunn (*JEA*, III, 281), Sethe derives *ifd* from *rb<sup>c</sup>*, by the aid of the Hamitic languages. Some of these offer the form *fdg*, which only makes matters worse. Possibly *ifd* stands for *\*rbg*, but a *non liquet* is safer until we see Sethe's explanation. There is also a possibility that *ifd* or *fdw* represents a different root from the Semitic *rb<sup>c</sup>*, which Brockelmann (*VG*, I, 485) thinks may be connected with 𐤃𐤍, 𐤃𐤍, and have referred originally to the four legs of a crouching beast (*et tu, Brutel!*). In Indo-European the word for 'four' may have meant originally "four-sided inclosure" (Nissen-Meyer, *WZKM*, XXVII, 185) though in Semitic we find no trace of such a development. *Ifd*, 'box,' means according to Sethe 'the four-sided, square object,' but its relation to *ifd* is not clear. If necessary *fdw* or *ifd* could be connected with 𐤋𐤃𐤍, 'divide,' and compared with 𐤁𐤃𐤍, 'small number,' from 𐤁𐤃𐤍, 'cut, divide,' but such suggestions are rather gratuitous.

<sup>5</sup> According to Sethe *dw* means 'hand, pentad (of fingers).' 𐤋𐤁, 'hand,' appears in the character for *d*.

<sup>6</sup> Brockelmann regards *sds* as the primary form. With all regard for such an eminent authority, I can only consider this form a secondary dissimilation (see above on *hmt*). South Arabian *sds* is on a par with *slθ* < *θlθ*, and the Aramaic 𐤍𐤃𐤍, Arabic 𐤍𐤃𐤍, are to be explained in the same way. There is plenty of evidence that combinatory changes had occurred before the Dispersion. The numerals *θlθ* and *sds* (or *\*θds*, which is possible, though, in view of 𐤍𐤃𐤍, not so likely) are modified reduplications (such as are common in Egyptian and found in Assyrian and Aramaic, though the type *Mediae geminatae* prevails).

<sup>7</sup> *H* for *h* is like late *hmm* for *hmm* < *\*hmm* = 𐤇𐤇𐤇. The *h* is the palatalized form of both *h* and *h̄*.

<sup>8</sup> By assimilation of the *c* to the surd *f*.

<sup>9</sup> By assimilation of the *b* to the surd *s*.

8.  $hmn^1 < smn^2 < \theta mn = \text{ثمن}$ .

9.  $psd^3 < tsd^4 < tsq^5 < tsn^5 < ts^c = \text{تسع}$ .

10.  $md = ?^6$ ;  $\text{عشر} = {}^c s^3$  (Ember).

The words for 'twenty' Coptic  $\chi\omicron\upsilon\omega\tau$ , etc., 'thirty,'  $m^c b^3 = \text{MAAB}$ , and 'forty,'  $2ME$ , are different from the corresponding Semitic.  $M^c b^3$  reminds one forcibly of  $\text{מעבר}$ , 'passage';<sup>7</sup> can it refer originally to the number of days in a lunar revolution, or "passage"?  $\check{S}^3 t$ , 'hundred' =  $\text{שׁE}$ , is at present a riddle.  $H^3$ , 'thousand' ( $\text{שׁO}$ ), is hard to separate from  $h^3$ , 'to measure,' and  $mh^3 t$ , 'balance,' possibly related to  $h^3$ , 'lotus,' perhaps connected with the stem  $\text{חלל}$ ,  $\text{חל}$ , 'hollow out'; cf. Eth.  $\text{ሐረት}$ , *hellat*, 'reed.' Similarly,  $\text{קנה}$ , *qneh*, 'beam of a balance' (properly 'reed') is employed by metonymy for 'balance.' *Hfn*, 'hundred thousand,' is to be connected, according

<sup>1</sup> See above, on *hmt*, 'three.'

<sup>2</sup>  $\check{S}$  for  $\theta$  arises by dissimilation from the dental  $n$ . There may even have been a tendency to change  $n$  to the corresponding stop,  $d$ , just as  $m$  often becomes  $b$ .

<sup>3</sup> Again dissimilation; the  $d$  was pronounced, of course, like  $\text{ج} = d\check{z}$ ,  $\check{z}$ . It is possible that we may have a similar case in *bnr*, 'date,' perhaps for  $*dnr < *dmr < *tmr = \text{תמר}$ . (Ember has identified *dqr* with  $\text{דקל}$ ). However, we may have to do with a peculiar metathesis, in which the nasalization of the second consonant is retained. Max Müller (*RT*, XXXI, 199, n. 1) suggests the evolution  $bnr < *vnr < *fnr < *fmr < *\theta mr = \text{تمر}$ , 'fruit.' Such an origin and development would indeed be extraordinary in the case of a loan-word. It is unlikely that  $\text{تمر}$  and  $\text{تمر}$  are connected; in the meaning 'date palm,' the latter is common Semitic, coming from a stem meaning 'be lofty.' Nor is there any need to regard *bnr* as a loan-word; even such a man as Zimmern can push the theory of loan-words too far. Would a word for 'date' be borrowed by Egyptians?

<sup>4</sup> The  $d = \check{z}$  for  ${}^c$  is found in a number of words; e.g.,  $ndm = \text{נדם}$ ,  $nd\check{s} = \text{נעס}$  (Ember),  $\check{s}dm = \text{سدم}$ . Since the reverse process also seems to occur in the vicinity of a nasal, as  $mn^c t$ , 'nurse'  $< mn\check{d}t$  ( $mnd$ , 'suckle' =  $\text{ملج}$ , Ember; Assy. *mulûgu* = 'nursing fee' primarily);  $hm^3 t$ , 'salt'  $< hm^c t < *hm\check{d}t$  ( $\text{حيف}$ ), we must, I think, explain the change on the following basis.

The  $\check{a}in$  was pronounced with a nasal sound, as among Sephardic Jews and in some parts of Northern Africa (cf. Müller, *OLZ*, XVII, 247 f.; also *KD*, p. 50). Hence the  $\check{a}in$ , in words containing a proximate nasal, was often dissimilated from the latter, a  $*n-ng-m$  thus becoming  $*ngm$ . When the  $g$  was palatalized, as was usually the case, the  $g$  became  $\check{g}$  ( $\check{g}$ ). In  $*ts\check{n}$ , then, we may assume a dissimilation between the dentals (as in  $*\theta mn$ , 'eight'), which gave rise to  $*ts\check{g} > *ts\check{d}$ .

<sup>5</sup> See preceding note.

<sup>6</sup> I have a number of conjectures in respect to the etymology of *md*, but they are very precarious. Brockelmann's idea (*VG*, I, 487) that *mt* (MHT, the later pronunciation of *md*, properly  $m\check{g}$  or  $m\check{c}$ ,  $m\check{c}$ ) may be  $\text{מאה}$ , 'hundred,' just as Eth. *ʿelf* means 'ten thousand,' is naturally untenable.

<sup>7</sup> The stem  $\text{עבר}$  appears otherwise in Egyptian as  $\check{p}i$ , 'pass over,' as shown by Ember, *AZ*, LI, 121.

to Sethe's excellent suggestion, with Arabic *ḥafl*, 'multitude.'<sup>1</sup> *Dḥ*, 'ten thousand,' means properly 'finger,' which would indicate that the finger was used for 'ten thousand' in the primitive system of counting employed in predynastic Egypt, as well as for 'one.' *Hihî* (*hḥ*), 'million,' is literally 'what is sought for (but not attained),' 'illimitably great,' from *hîhî*, 'to seek,' perhaps akin to *ḥw(i)*, 'gather' = حوى (Ember); similarly Ember combines *gmî*, 'find,' with جمع, 'gather.'

From the examination of the names of the numerals and the parts of the body we may turn away reassured to more general comparisons. While our study is only in its beginnings, marked

<sup>1</sup> The combination of *hfn* and حفل appears almost certain. The stem-meaning is 'flow,' hence 'flow together, assemble' (cf. نَفَر - نَفَر, شَفَعَة and شَفَعَة, and the cases cited JAOS, XXXVI, 230 f.). We have a precisely similar development in the Amharic word for 'thousand,' *ših*, *sih*, which Praetorius, *Amharische Sprache*, p. 204, combines, by the aid of the Ethiopic, with سِيح, 'to flow.' From the same

stem I would derive Eg. *h<sup>c</sup>pi*, the Nile; the writing *h<sup>c</sup>pr* is false (cf. *ĀZ*, XLIV, 114; XLV, 140; and Max Müller, *RT*, XXXI, 196). *H<sup>c</sup>p*, undoubtedly stands for \**h<sup>3</sup>pi* (the <sup>3</sup> frequently is changed by a contiguous *h* to <sup>c</sup>; cf. *b<sup>3</sup>hi*, 'abound, flood,' from \**b<sup>3</sup>hi* = بجر, Ember, *ĀZ*, LI, 114). A secondary <sup>3</sup> is just as common in Egyptian after the initial letter as an <sup>3</sup> in verbs *quartae infirmae* is in Assyrian (cf. כָּלַם and כָּלַם, פָּרַד and פָּרַד, חָלַץ and חָלַץ, חָלַץ and חָלַץ [which are connected, as I shall show elsewhere], etc.). Considering the character of the forms, as, e.g., <sup>c</sup>*pp*, Apophis, the 'flying dragon' (from <sup>c</sup>*pp*), <sup>c</sup>*ff*, 'flying insect' (such by-forms with *f=p* are common in Egyptian, and, while they can hardly be explained on an accentual basis, à la Werner, they certainly do not support Grimme's *p*-theory (*ZDMG*, LXVIII, 259 ff.), according to which proto-Semitic *p* appears in Eth. as *p*, in Arab. as *b*, in Heb.-Aram. as *p*; *p<sup>3</sup>*(?) appears as Eth. *p*, *b*, and as *b* in the other languages; *p<sup>3</sup>* becomes Eth.-Arab. *f*, Heb.-Aram. *p*, Assy. *p*. Such hairsplitting is only allowable on the basis of a mass of assured etymologies, which few of Grimme's are. Grimme, moreover, pays no attention to the far-reaching influence of assimilation. At present I do not think we can safely go beyond two proto-Semitic *p*'s, *p* and *p*, *R<sup>3</sup>hš* (*I<sup>3</sup>hš*, *R<sup>3</sup>hš*, Pyr. 994c, 1476, etc.), etc., I suspect we have to do with old participial forms (i.e., *qa'atil*, or the like, for *qatil*, which may have arisen from the analogy of broken plurals like فواوس, plural of فارس). حفل means 'flow abundantly, torrentially'; حفل بالسيال = 'be swollen to its bank by a torrent' (of a stream). Somewhat similarly, *mḥi*, 'be flooded' (*šmḥ*, 'irrigate') may be connected with *mḥ*, 'fill' (MOY2, connected by Ember with Hamitic *bāḥ*, 'to fill'; cf. باحة, pl. بروج, 'flood,

mass of water'); cf. *mīlu*, 'flood' (= *mīlu kiššati*), from *malū*, מָלָא, 'fill, be full.' Ember thinks that *mrit*, 'river wall, embankment, quay' (like Assy. *kāru*), belongs to מָלָא; cf. *mr*, *mī*, 'lake, canal,' orig. perhaps 'inundation.' Talmudic מְלִירוּתָא (Levy 2, 128b) has precisely this meaning; it is paraphrased by גִּירָא דְנָרָא = *kār nārī*. Another parallel to *mḥi*, etc., is given by Dennefeld, *Geburtsomina*, p. 46, l. 5, etc., who points out the word *abālu*, 'flood' (*nāru ibbal-ma*, "der Fluss wird anschwellen," instead of *nāru šubtu<sup>m</sup> ibbalakit*, a grammatically impossible reading). The stem is clearly, however, not *abālu*-وَبِل, which never means 'flow,' but only 'bring,' in Assyrian, but *abālu* (šutābulu)-حَبِل, 'be full.'

progress has already been made. Professor Ember alone has discovered some six or seven hundred equivalences which are either certain or probable, besides making a great many doubtful suggestions. With the hundred and fifty which I shall propose and discuss in this paper, and the etymologies previously known, which we owe to Brugsch, Erman, Sethe, Steindorff, Max Müller, and others, the total number approaches the thousand mark, a progress which is most encouraging, in view of the limited time we devote to this study. In many cases we have plausible theories, but, because of phonetic or semasiological difficulties which, though explicable, might arouse suspicion, they are being withheld for the present. Other troubles arise from a veritable *embarras de choix*. Owing to the phonetic breakdown of the language, it is often possible to propose several different etymologies for the same word, between which selection is hazardous in the present stage of investigation. In the case of such incompatible Semitic forms as  $h^c$ , 'stand,' we must await the future, though confident that we have to deal with complicated processes of phonetic change. Possible etymologies come readily enough to mind.

The proportion of words so far etymologized is greater than the number mentioned above would indicate; we have, of course, fought shy of doubtful words. To illustrate the situation I have gone through Erman's *Glossar*, counting the word-stems for which Semitic equivalents have been found; over 50 per cent is clear; some 20 per cent is doubtful, and the remaining 30 per cent is reserved for the future, many of the words being doubtful in meaning or having special and technical values. Some words are presumably non-Semitic (see above). To this category may belong such words as  $r^3$ , 'mouth'; *miw*, 'cat' (onomatopoetic);  $3b$ , 'elephant'; *dng*, 'dwarf,' etc. Many names of plants and animals may belong here.

Among new phonetic correspondences which I shall try to establish is  $t < \text{ט}$  as well as  $\text{ת} < h$ ,  $\text{ש} < \check{s}$ ,  $d = \text{ד}$ ,  $f = \text{פ}$ , the last two of which are sporadic, just as in the other Semitic languages. Professor Ember had previously thought of the first three, but had not enough cases to establish them. *T* for  $\text{ט}$  is precisely what should have been expected; the equation  $d = \text{ד}$  is late. I have about thirty new cases, in addition to those previously pointed out: e.g., *tīt*, 'pus, matter' =  $\text{טִיט}$  (Brugsch); *twr*, 'be clean' =  $\text{טוּר}$ ; *bt<sup>3</sup>*, 'sin' =  $\text{בטר}$ ;

*tʃi*, 'leap' = طفر; perhaps *bwt*, 'abominate, loath' = بوط, بدل بعد  
 جَلّ (all due to Ember); Coptic τλτλ, 'drip' = طلّ (Ember); *stf*,  
 'overflow' = ستف (Müller; the word is late).<sup>1</sup> Among the new cases  
 are the following, which I shall fully discuss in the list of correspond-  
 ences with which this paper will close: *ith*, 'shoot' = إته, etc.; *wt*,  
 'wind' = طوى; *wtt*, 'serpent' = طوط (cf. تطوى, 'coil'); *ptr*, 'see' =  
 فطر; *nht*, 'be strong' = نشط; *h̄tm*, 'perish' = حطم; *h̄nt*, 'nose' = خطم;  
*ht*, 'tree' = هattu, etc.; *h̄ti*, 'engrave' = خط; *h̄ti*, 'follow' = خطو; *h̄tht*,  
 'err' = خطأ; *sti*, 'shoot' = سطر, است; *stwh*, 'soil one's self' = طيخ;  
*t3*, 'land, ground' = طاعة; *titi*, 'tread' = وطى; *twt*, 'resemble' = وطو;  
*twt*, 'assemble' = انطوى; *tnm*, 'lose the way' = طلب; *thb*, 'moisten' =  
 تب; *tš*, 'yield' = طمش. In at least two cases *d* corresponds ety-  
 mologically to ط, perhaps brought about by the other accompanying  
 emphatic consonants; *qdf*, 'pluck' = قطف (Ember), and *šdh*, 'must,'  
 which I would connect with شط, 'press out grapes' (see below for  
 discussion). By the New Empire, of course, *d* is the phonetic equiva-  
 lent of ط, as appears from loan-words and transcriptions.

The change of *h* to š (ש) is familiar to us from Coptic. The  
 fluctuation between these consonants is common in all periods of  
 Egyptian history. Even in the early age we have, e.g., *ih̄t-iš̄t*,  
 'thing'; *h̄m-š̄m*, 'hawk' = هم, رخم (Ember). The strongly pala-  
 talized *h* is the intermediary, like German *ch* in *ich*, which varies in  
 different parts of the Teutonic world from *h* to *š*, though the standard  
 pronunciation is *h*. Similarly we have حم, 'be hot,' appearing as *h̄mm*  
 (rare), *h̄mm*, and *š̄mm*. We have many cases to show that *h* may  
 stand either for palatalized *h* or for palatalized *h̄*; cf., e.g., *h̄q* =  
 حلق; *H̄nm* = حمل (Ember); *h̄si*, 'be miserable' = خزي; *h̄db*, 'kill'  
 = خذب, 'strike, wound' (both due to Ember).<sup>2</sup> Dozens of illustra-  
 tions could easily be given.

<sup>1</sup> Müller's combination of *ptb* with טפה (*GB*<sup>16</sup>, s.v.) is very improbable. טפה  
 corresponds to بطح (unpointed ט) rather than to فطح, however. Assy. *tappu*,

sole of the foot, moreover, I would combine with طقف, 'spread, stretch'; contrast Holma,  
*Körperteile*, p. 138 (Eg. *ibt*, 'sole, sandal,' which Holma combines with *tappu*, is, of course  
 رگل, with Ember, who has found the writing with *k* in the Pyr. Texts).

<sup>2</sup> With خذب, 'wound,' and *h̄db* I would combine Assy. *huppudu*, 'strike out' (an  
 eye), 'destroy' (Code of Hammurapi, rev., XVII, 49; XVIII, 82; XXI, 24, etc.).



The change of *š* to *h* is found, for example, in Spanish; cf. Groeber's *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*<sup>2</sup>, p. 900, etc. Such sounds as *ss*, *s<sub>i</sub>*, *l<sub>i</sub>* become *š*, written *x*, and fall together with *j* (*i*), pronounced *ž*, *š*. About the sixteenth to the seventeenth century *š* became *h<sub>i</sub>*, *h*, while the spelling *x*, *j* was retained. Finally, in the nineteenth century, the spelling *j* prevailed. Latin *passerem*, 'sparrow,' became \**pašero*, *paxaro*, *pajaro*, 'bird'; Lat. *mulier(em)* became \**mušer*, *muxer*, *mujer*; Lat. *filium* became \**fišo*, *fixo*, *hijo*, and so on. Similarly, in Egyptian we have *h* for *ش* in *hmt*, 'three,' for \**šnt* (see above); *hmn*, 'eight,' for \**šmn*; *iht*, 'thing' = شىء (Ember); *wbh*, 'white' (> OYOB 𓂏𓂐𓂑𓂒; note the phonetic cycle, which appears in most languages with a long history, as Greek) = وبش (Ember); *nht*, 'be strong' = نشط (Albright); *nh*, 'live' = عيش, and the cases cited below, s.v. *nh*. For the reverse change, above considered, note the cases collected below s.v. *wsš*, 'urinate,' *sš*, 'nest,' *šw<sub>i</sub>*, 'be empty,' *šrt*, 'nose,' *šps<sub>i</sub>*, etc. I think they will be sufficient to establish the fact of the sound change, even should some of the dozen be proved eventually wrong. The two remaining changes *d* < *l* and *f* < ث will be treated s.v. *dd*, 'boy,' *ddb*, 'prick, stab,' and *fq<sub>2</sub>*, 'reward.' I will not devote any more space to the discussion of the phonetic laws which govern the growth of the Egyptian language, as Professor Ember hopes to publish an elaborate study of the subject in the near future.

Granted that Egyptian is Semitic, in morphology, syntax, and vocabulary, what is its precise position among the languages of the group? Hommel believes that it is most closely akin to Assyrian; his arguments are always interesting, but often singularly devoid of foundation. He complicates the issue hopelessly by attempting to show that the Egyptian civilization is a daughter of the Sumero-Babylonian, and comparing Egyptian words of all kinds with Sumerian vocables as well as with Assyrian. Of course, the only logical result of such a method is the curious glottogonic theory of Ball, that the Sumerian is proto-Semitic, and that all Eurasian tongues go back to a common radical stock. Considering these heresies, one is tempted to say with the apostle, τὰ γὰρ γινόμενα ὑπ' αὐτῶν αἰσχρόν ἐστιν καὶ λέγειν. Such Hommelian equations as *rn-pt* (stem 𓂣𓂰, Ember) = Sum. *mu-ana*, 'name of heaven' = 'year';

Osiris=Asaru, both written with the signs for 'seat' or 'settlement,' and 'eye,' are surely accidental, just as fortuitous as the *rapport* between Hebrew and English which delights the young Hebraist with "me is who, who is he, and he is she." From such materials brilliant calembours may be made, but never philology. The similarities between Old Egyptian and Sumero-Babylonian civilization are in part due to similar environments, in part to Mediterranean and Semitic elements common to both, and partly to the transfusion of related cultures, separated by a distance not at all insuperable and occupied by peoples far removed from savagery and well adapted to serve as intermediaries.<sup>1</sup>

From the grammatical standpoint, Egyptian resembles Assyrian and South Arabian rather more closely than the other Semitic tongues. *S* for *h* in the causative and in the third person of the pronoun is characteristic of Assyrian and Minean. As, however, a great many Semitic words beginning with *s* found in all the languages are unquestionably old causatives (just as in Egyptian), no conclusion can be safely drawn from forms which may only be stray survivals in Hamitic, Assyrian, and South Arabian. One important phenomenon is common to Egyptian and Assyrian—the qualitative, called usually by Egyptologists the pseudoparticiple and by Assyriologists the per-mansive. So far as I know, no trace of such a formation has been discovered in the South Semitic languages. Certain features common to Egyptian and Assyrian may be expected also in South Arabian; there is in some respects a close connection between Ethiopic and Assyrian (see Haupt, *JAOS*, XIII, 252 ff.) as well as between South Arabian proper (Sabeian, Minean, etc.) and Assyrian (Hommel, *passim*). A number of things are found *only* in Egyptian and Ethiopic, as the *nif'al* of reduplicated verbs: e.g., Eg. *ngšgš*, *nhmhm*, *nšršr*, *ngdqđ*, etc.; Eth. አንገርገር, አንሰሰወ, አንኩኩረ, etc.<sup>2</sup> Eth. በበ and ለለ as distributives remind one of Eg. *mm*. Egyptian shares

<sup>1</sup> For an illustration of such influence see Petrie, *Ancient Egypt*, 1917, pp. 26-36. The heroic figure wearing a long robe is not Babylonian, but North Mesopotamian. Petrie and Bénédite hold from the archaeological evidence that there had been a gradual infiltration of the dynastic people from the east during the second prehistoric age before the dynastic conquest. I forbear from making obvious combinations. Neither language nor culture is proof of race, the determination of which depends upon other anatomical and anthropological considerations. At present, collaboration between the archaeologist and the philologist in settling problems of prehistory leads to such doubtful results that one is tempted to quote Schiller's epigram:

"Feindschaft sei zwischen euch! Noch kommt das Bündnis zu frühe;  
Wenn ihr im Suchen euch trennt, wird erst die Wahrheit erkannt."

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Hommel, *Geschichte und Geographie*, p. 146, n. 1.

the nominal preformative *h* with Mehri (Ember, *ÄZ*, LI, 117, n. 2). In discussing the numeral *hmt*, 'three,' it was noticed that the path of its development leads through South Arabia, though, of course, no stress can be laid on such isolated analogies.

From the lexical viewpoint, we arrive at similar results. While some Egyptian words find their etyma only in Hebrew, in Aramaic, or in Assyrian, a large number of characteristic words appear only in Ethiopic, or in Ethiopic and Arabic. Of course, the vast majority of words find equivalents only in Arabic, which is quite natural, considering the relative completeness of our knowledge of the peninsular dialects. As the قاموس contains a great many South Arabian words in its voluminous basin, agreements in vocabulary may often be placed to the credit of the southern tribes. The number of Ethiopic-Egyptian etymologies I have collected will, no doubt, be greatly increased by investigation.<sup>1</sup> Among cases which will be fully discussed below, are *iḥt*, 'inundation,' *iḥi*, 'to flood,' and **አደጋ** : 'deluge'; *wnwn*, 'shake, sway' = **ወለለ** : 'shake'; *inp*, 'offspring' = **ወለብ** : 'egg'; *nʿi*, 'come' = **ነገ** : 'come' (only in imperative); *hsp*, 'district, nome' = **ከዝብ** : 'tribe, section' (حزب); *hpʷ*, 'navel' = **ከንብርኽ** : *ššʿi*, 'walk, roam' = **ሰሰወ** : ; *dbt*, 'brick' = **ገገፋል** : (جبل).

The resemblance between Ethiopic and Egyptian must not, however, be associated with the present home of the Abyssinians, as the Geʿez probably did not emigrate from Arabia until well along in the first pre-Christian millennium. While our knowledge of prehistoric movements is so nebulous, conjecture is cheap. It seems to me more likely that the Semites entered Northern Africa by way of the Isthmus of Suez than by way of Qoṣēr and Koptos. Of course, the latter was an important trade route from the earliest times. There are those who believe with Hommel that the Amorites were of South Arabian origin, like the tribe of Ġassân twenty-five centuries after. Who can tell what may have happened another twenty-five centuries before?

[To be continued]

<sup>1</sup> Of course, allowance must be made for the presence of Hamitic loan-words in Amharic and, to some extent, already in Ethiopic. To this category probably belong the cases pointed out by Ember, as *mr*, 'chisel' = Amh. *mārō*; *dng*, 'dwarf' = Amh. *denk*; *fnḏ*, 'nose' = Amh. *afen;ā* (*JAOS*, XXXVII, 21). *Fnd*, 'nose,' I regard as Semitic; cf. *nācu*, *šanācu*, **كنص**, 'turn up the nose, sneer.' Rhyme formations are very common in Semitic. An interesting case for Ethiopic is *eska*, 'until' = Eg. *išl* < \**išk* (Ember), Meroitic *zik*, Kunama *ašik* (Schuchhardt, *WZKM*, XXVII, 183).